

REMARKS**I. INTRODUCTION**

Claims 1 and 4 have been amended. The Drawings have also been amended. No new matter has been added. Claim 3 was previously withdrawn. Claim 2 has been cancelled. Thus, claims 1 and 4-10 remain pending in this application. The Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating the allowability of claims 2 and 4-6. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the above-identified claims are allowable.

The amended claims have merely incorporated the subject matter of a dependent claim and no additional language has been added to the claims. Thus, the amendments should be entered because they are merely recitations that have been previously considered and searched by Examiner.

II. THE DRAWING OBJECTIONS SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

The drawings have been amended to include labels in boxes 6, 8 and 18. Thus, the objection to the drawing should be withdrawn.

III. THE 35 U.S.C. §102(b) REJECTION SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

Claims 1 and 8-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,274,419 to Tam et al. (hereinafter "Tam"). (See 1/15/2008 Office Action p. 2).

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of dependent claim 2. The Examiner has indicated that claim 2 contains allowable subject matter. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable because it has been amended to include the allowable language of dependent claim 2.

Furthermore, claim 8 recites a system comprising an electrode assembly according to claim 1. Because claim 8 comprises an electrode assembly of claim 1 and, therefore, includes all the limitations of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that claims 8-10 are also allowable.

IV. THE 35 U.S.C. §103(a) REJECTION SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Tam in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,311,152 Modes et al. (hereinafter “Modes”). (See 1/15/2008 Office Action pp. 2-3).

Applicants submit that Modes does not cure the above described deficiencies of Tam with respect to claim 1. Because claim 7 depends from, and therefore includes all the limitations of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that this claim is also allowable for at least the same reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

V. THE OBJECTION TO THE DECLARATION SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

The Examiner objected to the Declaration. (See 1/15/2008 Office Action p. 4). A new Declaration has been submitted with this amendment. Thus, the objection should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the remarks submitted above, the Applicants respectfully submit that the present case is in condition for allowance. All issues raised by the Examiner have been addressed, and a favorable action on the merits is thus earnestly requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Michael J. Marcin (Reg. No. 48,198)

Fay Kaplun & Marcin, LLP
150 Broadway, Suite 702
New York, New York 10038
Tel: (212) 619-6000
Fax: (212) 619-0276

Dated: March 24, 2008